PB80-192461

Methodologies to Conduct Regulatory Impact Analysis of Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide

SRI International
Menlo Park, CA

Prepared for

Environmental Protection Agency
Research Triangle Park, NC

Dec 79

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
NTIS

United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Office of Air Quality
Planning and Standards
Research Triangle Park NC 27711

EPA-450/5-80-006
December 1979

Air

PB80-192461

EPA

Methodologies to Conduct Regulatory Impact Analysis of Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

1. REPORT NO.	2.	3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO.
EPA-450/5-80-006		PB 80 192461

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5. REPORT DATE
METHODOLOGIES TO CONDUCT REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS OF AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CARBON MONOXIDE	December 1979
	6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE

7. AUTHOR(S)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.
Waheed Siddiqee Andre Dermant Robert Patterson	6780

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.
SRI International 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, California 94025	11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO. 68-02-2835

12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS	13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Strategies and Air Standards Division Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27711	Final 14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16. ABSTRACT

The report is a summary of a methodology developed to analyze mobile source emission reductions needed to attain alternative proposed national ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide. A costing routine is part of the procedure. The methodology was used in the carbon monoxide regulatory impact analysis for alternative national air standards.

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group
Economic analysis Transportation Air pollution	Regulatory analysis Transportation controls Inspection and Maintenance (I&M)	

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	19. SECURITY CLASS *(This Report)*	21. NO OF PAGES
General	Unclassified	
	20. SECURITY CLASS *(This page)*	22. PRICE
	Unclassified	

EPA Form 2220-1 (9-73)

EPA-450/5-80-006

Methodologies to Conduct Regulatory Impact Analysis of Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide

by

Waheed Siddiqee, Robert Patterson, and Andre Dermant

SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, California 94025

Contract No. 68-02-2835

EPA Project Officers: Thomas McCurdy and Kenneth Lloyd
Prepared for

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Air, Noise, and Radiation
Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711

December 1979

iA

This report is issued by the Environmental Protection Agency to report technical data of interest to a limited number of readers. Copies are available - in limited quantities - from the Library Services Office (MD-35), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; or for a fee, from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Publication No. EPA-450/5-80-006

FOREWORD

As its second task under Contract No. 68-02-2835, Work Assignment Number 19, SRI International was to develop a computer program to conduct various impact analyses of ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide. The initial general specifications of the desired program were contained in Attachment A of the work assignment. Various modifications and additions were implemented in the program as the specific requirements became more clear during the course of the project.

This report summarizes the functional details of the final version of the program as it existed in the month of September 1979. Technical details and a user's manual for the program have been documented separately.*

---

*A. Dermant, R. Patterson, and W. Siddiqee, "Program to Conduct Regulatory Impact Analysis of Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide," Contract No. 68-02-2835, SRI Project 6780, SRI International, Menlo Park, California (September 1979).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the guidance and suggestions received from Messrs. Thomas McCurdy, Kenneth Lloyd, and George Duggan of EPA, in developing the desired computer program. Their active participation in the project work was extremely valuable in refining the program to fully meet the requirements of EPA. Thanks are also due to Mr. Eugene Schelar of SRI who generated computer runs using MOBILE 1 programs that were used to develop Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program (FMVCP) emission factors and Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) Effectiveness Factors.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS iv

LIST OF TABLES v

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. SUMMARY OF THE BASIC METHODOLOGY 3

3. SOURCES OF INPUT DATA 10

3.1 County Related Data 10

3.2 Input Data Applicable to all Counties 13

3.3 Input Data Related to Costs and Fuel Savings 18

4. SPECIFIC ASSUMPTIONS AND CALCULATION PROCEDURES 20

4.1 County Related Analysis 20

4.2 Urban Area Related Analysis and Summary Reports 34

4.2.1 Urban Area Related Analyses 35

4.2.2 Summary Tables 38

APPENDICES

A LIST OF 272 COUNTIES AND URBAN AREAS WITH STATUS OF I/M PROGRAMS A-2

B THE ALTERNATIVE CO STANDARDS INCLUDED IN THE PROGRAM AND THE BASIS FOR CALCULATING DESIGN VALUES B-2

C CONVERSION OF EMISSION DENSITY VALUES TO SURROGATE DESIGN VALUES C-2

D ORIGINAL COUNTY AREAWIDE VMT GROWTH FACTORS D-2

E MOBILE SOURCE CO EMISSIONS VERSUS AMBIENT TEMPERATURE . . E-2

F ASSUMPTIONS AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO COST AND FUEL SAVING FACTORS IN I/M & TCM PROGRAMS F-2

ILLUSTRATIONS

4.1 Sample of Analysis Results for Los Angeles County 21

4.2 Sample of Urban Area I/M Analysis Table 36

4.3 Sample of Individual Counties I/M Summary Table 39

4.4 Sample of Summary Table of Counties Needing TCM 41

TABLES

2.1 Basis County-Related Data Stored in the County File 4

B-1 The 14 Alternative CO Standards Included in the Program B-4

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents a summary of the functional details of a computer program developed by SRI International in accordance with the specifications provided by EPA. The program has been designed to analyze the carbon monoxide-related data for counties in the United States that could be potentially in violation of current and proposed carbon monoxide (CO) standards. A list of the 272 counties and a discussion of the criteria for selecting these counties is included in Appendix A. A list and a discussion of the alternative forms and levels of the CO standard is given in Appendix B.

The following major activities were performed to accomplish the development of the program:

1. Collecting, processing and coding the basic data related to each of the 272 counties mentioned above.
2. Generating necessary effectiveness factors related to Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program (FMVCP) and Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) programs using the MOBILE 1 mobile source emission factors program.
3. Developing unit costs related to I/M programs and program Transportation Control Measures (TCM) in consultation with EPA project officers.
4. Developing the logic of the desired computer program and coding it in COBOL language.
5. Testing and debugging the program and producing a set of results

urgently needed by EPA.

6. Transferring the program and associated utility programs to North Carolina.

7. Preparing the present report.

8. Preparing a programmers manual for the program.

Various sections of this report include sufficiently detailed discussion of each of the above-noted activities.

2. SUMMARY OF THE BASIC METHODOLOGY

The overall logic of the program can conveniently be explained by considering a single county and noting that certain basic data about each county is stored in a county file as shown in Table 2.1. Tables of CO emission reduction factors due to Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program (FMVCP) and reduction factors due to Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) programs are also separately stored.

With the above-noted background information, the basic logic of the program can be stated as follows. Details of each of the following steps are presented in Section 4.

1. The existing design value of CO concentration corresponding to the standard being considered is compared with the value of the standard. If the design value is less than the value of the standard, the county is not in violation of the standard and is not analyzed any further for that standard. If the design value is greater than the value of the standard, the needed percentage reduction (also called rollback) is calculated as follows:

$$\%R = \frac{D - S}{D - B} \times 100$$

where

%R = Percentage rollback
D = Design value in mg/m^3
S = Value of the standard mg/m^3
B = Background level of concentration mg/m^3

Table 2.1

BASIC COUNTY-RELATED DATA STORED
IN THE COUNTY FILE

1.	County Code	(e.g., 01073)
2.	County name	(e.g., Jefferson)
3.	State code	(e.g., AL)
4.	Area emissions 1979	(tons/year)
5.	Point emissions 1979	(tons/year)
6.	Mobile emissions 1976*	(tons/year)
7.	Emission density	(tons/sq. mile/year)
8.	Population 1970	(SMSA or urban area population to which the county belongs)
9.	Population 1980	
10.	Population 1985	
11.	Population 1990	
12.	Population adjustment factor 1980	(based on BEA data)
13.	Population adjustment factor 1985	
14.	Population adjustment factor 1990	
15.	VMT growth factor	(annual %)
16.	County passenger car count 1977	
17.	14 design values	(mg/m^3)
18.	Temperature	(degrees F)
19.	Location code	(low altitude, high altitude, California)
20.	Background concentration level	(mg/m^3)
21.	Code indicating I/M program in county	
22.	Code indicating I/M program in state	
23.	Urbanized area code	

*The 1979 line emissions were not readily available. However 1976 estimated values were available based on 75° temperature. These are used as a base value and the projected values for 1979, 1982, etc. are calculated by the program using suitable factors as will be explained later in this report.

For example, suppose the current 8-hour second high design value of a county is 14 mg/m^3 and the background level is zero. Comparing it with the 8-hour second high standard of 10 mg/m^3, it is seen that the needed percentage reduction is: $\frac{14-10}{14-0} \times 100 = 28.6\%$. (1)

For those counties not having design value data, emission densities are used as design value surrogates to calculate the percentage rollback. Specifically:

$$\%R = \frac{(d - QD) \times 100}{(QD - b)}$$

where

d = Emisson density of the county in tons/sq. mile/year

Q = A factor to convert the value of standard from mg/m^3 to tons/sq. mile/year

D = Value of standard in mg/m^3

b = Background density in tons/sq. mile/year.

The value of conversion factor Q has been calculated to be 107.43 as explained in Appendix C.

2. The above-noted reduction factor is used to calculate the total allowable emissions for the county as follows:

$$E_a = (1 - \frac{\%R}{100})(E_e) \text{ tons}$$

where

E_a = Allowable emissions in tons/year

E_e = Total emissions in 1979.

For example, suppose the total 1979 emissions of the above-noted county are 333,870 tons/year. The allowable emissions then are:

$(1 - .286) \times 333870 = 238478$ tons (2)

3. Projected emissions for the years 1982*, 1984*, and 1987* are calculated for area, point, and line source emissions. Area source emissions are assumed to be directly proportional to population, point source emissions are projected using projections for national total manufacturing income (from OBERS and BEA reports) and line source emissions are projected based on the FMVCP-related factors and VMT growth factors based on National Functional System Mileage Travel Summary, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1977. An average VMT growth factor for all counties can also be specified as an option.

4. The total projected emissions for each of the three years 1982, 1984 and 1987 are compared with the allowable emissions. If the projected emissions in 1982, 1984 and 1987 are all less than the allowable emissions, the county data is not analyzed any further. In case the projected emissions in any of the years 1982, 1984, and 1987 are greater than the allowable emissions, the needed reductions for the respective years are calculated as:

   Needed reduction in 1982 (1984, 1987) = Projected emissions in 1982 (1984, 1987) - Allowable emissions.

   The needed reduction is then converted to a percentage of needed reduction using the projected emissions of the corresponding year as the base value. If the projected emissions are less

---

*The rationale for considering these three specific years is as follows: The Clean Air Act requires compliance with current levels of CO standards by 1982 and with new stricter standards (if introduced) by 1984. An extension to 1987 is granted, if necessary, provided that suitable inspection and maintenance programs and other control strategies are shown to be included in the state implementation plans.

than the allowable emissions, the needed reductions are assumed to be zero. Considering the above example, suppose the projected total emissions are calculated to be:

1982	267,720 tons/year
1984	221,010 tons/year
1987	168,728 tons/year

Therefore, the needed reductions are:

1982: 267,720-238,478 = 29,242 tons

The projected emissions in 1984 and 1987 are both less than the allowable emissions, therefore the needed reductions for 1984 and 1987 are assumed to be zero. The needed reduction of 29,242 tons in 1982 is expressed as a percentage of 1982 emissions, i.e.,

$$\text{percentage reduction needed in 1982} = \frac{29,242}{267,720} \times 100 = 11\%$$

5. An I/M program with an appropriate stringency[#] is then selected. Three stringency levels are included in the program, namely 20%, 30% and 40%.[*] Associated with each stringency level is an estimated percentage reduction in CO emissions of the total car population. For example, an I/M program with a 20% stringency, initiated in 1984 in a low altitude area with an ambient temperature of 50°F, is estimated to reduce to CO emissions of the total car population by 13.8%. Factors similar to this are stored in a table for various temperatures,

---

[#]Stringency of an I/M program indicates the strictness of the test standards. The stricter the standards the more the percentage of tested cars that will fail the test. Thus, an I/M program characterized by a stringency of 20% means that the test standards are so selective that 20% of the tested cars will fail.

[*]See also the discussions of I/M factors in Section 2.2.

locations and I/M program initiation years. If possible, the smallest of the three stringency factors (i.e., 20%, 30%, and 40%) that produces an overall reduction at least as high as the needed reduction is selected. However, if even the highest of the three stringency factors does not produce the needed reduction, then the highest stringency is selected and a need for additional transportation control measures (TCM) is established.

6. Assuming that a certain stringency factor has been selected, the I/M investment costs, inspection costs and repair costs are calculated for the year 1987, using the projected car population of the country in 1987 and using average unit costs. For example, suppose the projected 1987 car population of a county is 386,956 and the selected stringency factor is 20%. The I/M related costs are then calculated using the following relationships:

   - I/M investment cost = (386,956)(average investment cost per car--$13.21/car)

   - I/M inspection cost = (386,956)(average inspection cost per car--$7/car)

   - I/M repair cost = (386,956)(20/100)(average repair cost per car--$22/car)

7. The expected fuel saving in 1987 due to the implementation of I/M program is also calculated using essentially the following relationship:

   Fuel saving due to I/M = (car population)(stringency factor)(estimated fuel savings per repaired car)

Details of various factors used in the above calculation are

presented later in this report. The cost of the fuel saved is also calculated assuming an average price per gallon.

8. If the needed reductions in the future years are less than 5%, this is assumed to be realizable by TCM programs unless an I/M program already exists or is already planned for the county. Also, if an I/M program with the maximum allowable stringency is unable to accomplish the needed reduction, it is assumed that up to 5% additional reduction can be realized through TCM programs. Costs of the TCM program in 1987 are calculated using a relationship of the form:

    TCM costs = (tons reduced by TCM)(cost per ton reduced by TCM)

Fuel saved by TCM is also calculated using a relationship of the form:

    Fuel saved by TCM = (tons reduced by TCM)(fuel saved per ton of CO reduction by TCM)

Specific details of the above-noted relationships and the various factors used initially are presented in Section 4 and in Appendix F.

3. SOURCES OF INPUT DATA

A brief explanation related to the sources of various input data is presented in this section. Referring first to Table 2.1, the sources of various county related data are as follows.

3.1 County-Related Data

- County codes, county names, and state codes--Counties were coded by FIPS codes and appropriate state codes were selected using judgement.
- 1979 area emissions, 1979 point emissions, and 1976 line emissions--were supplied to SRI by EPA based on NEDS emission summary report (NE204, 1979). Line sources include all highway vehicles, i.e., passenger vehicles and trucks of all kinds. Area sources include space heating units, aircrafts, and vessels. Point sources essentially consist of industrial plants and solid waste processes. The 1979 line emissions are calculated by the program using appropriate VMT and FMVCP factors as will be explained later.
- Emission density data--was supplied by EPA in the form of a computer printout. This data contained CO emission density data for almost all the counties in the U.S.A with reference to FIPS codes of the counties. Density data for the counties to be analyzed were taken from this list and stored in the county file. As explained in Section 2, the density data is

used as a design value surrogate to calculate the percentage roll-back for those counties that do not have design value data. Appendix C includes technical details of the calculation of surrogate values.

- 1970/1980/1985/1990 populations of appropriate SMSAS/urban areas--were taken essentially from OBERS Projections - Regional Economic Activity in the U.S., 1972, U.S. Water Resources Council, WDC.*
- 1980/1985/1990 population adjustment factors--were derived from Population, Personal Incomes, and Earnings by State - Projections to 2000, October 1977, BEA, U.S. DOC.*
- VMT growth factors--were supplied by EPA, based on National Functional System Mileage Travel Summary, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1977. A copy of the original table is included in Appendix D for convenience. Where a VMT growth factor was unavailable, a 3% growth rate was assumed.
- 1977 passenger car count--was obtained for each county, based on passenger-car registrations, from the 1979 Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide published by Rand McNally and Company.
- Design values--An initial set of design values corresponding to existing standards was supplied by EPA, based on a validated SAROAD data base. The design values as they exist now in county files are based essentially on the initial set of values, supplemented and modified to some extent during the course of the project as more reliable data became available to EPA. There are still several

---

*Note: Refer also to the memo, "Uniform Growth Projections for NAAQS Economic Impact Assessments," dated January 9, 1979, from Jack McGinnity to Joseph Padget, Director, Strategies and Air Standards Division.

design values unavailable for many counties. However, the county file has provision for entering the missing design values when they become available. The program is designed to use the emission density data in place of missing design values to calculate the needed reductions (rollbacks) as explained in Section 2 and Appendix C.

- Temperature--Temperatures associated with each county were selected by SRI in consultation with EPA. The value used is the mean monthly average temperature for January rounded to the nearest ten degrees.
- Location code--The location codes, i.e., low altitude, high altitude and California, were assigned to the counties in consultation with EPA. Actual codes used in the county file are 1 for low altitude, 2 for high and 3 for California.
- Background concentration level--The background levels for all counties have been assumed to be zero for initial analysis. However, there is provision to change them to suitable nonzero values.
- Codes indicating the status of I/M programs in county and states--were inferred from a list received from EPA on the status of I/M as of May 1979 ("Inspection/Maintenance Status Sheets," EPA, Ann Arbor, Michigan, May 29, 1979.) This list indicated the counties belonging to various urban areas, updated design values related to 8-hour second high standard, and gave the status of I/M programs in various counties and states. A consolidated version of this list including information related to the status of I/M programs is included in Appendix A. This appendix also contains information about urban areas

based on a report by Bureau of the Census.*

- Urbanized area code--As mentioned above, a list of the urbanized area names and counties belonging to each of the urban areas is included in Appendix A. The program is designed to calculate the needed CO reductions and the I/M cost not only on a county basis but also to estimate the CO reduction and I/M costs for various urban areas. This is needed since I/M programs will generally be implemented on an urban basis rather than on a county basis.

3.2 Input Data Applicable to All Counties

- FMVCP factors--The FMVCP factors as stored in the program are compounded annual percentage reductions in CO emission due to FMVCP, considering all modes. These FMVCP factors were developed by SRI using the MOBILE 1 program for temperatures through 80° in 10-degree increments for three locations, i.e., low altitude, high altitude and California. (Note: A temperature of 75° is also considered in the interval 70° and 80°.) Other assumptions related to MOBILE 1 are:

Mode Mix: Light-Duty Vehicles (LDV) - 80.3%

Light-Duty Trucks (LDT1) (<6000 lbs) - 5.8%

Light-Duty Trucks (LDT2) (6001-8500 lbs) - 5.8%

Heavy-Duty Gas Trucks (HDG) - 4.5%

Heavy-Duty Diesel Trucks (HDD) - 3.1%

Motorcycles (MC) - 0.5%

---

*Bureau of the Census, Population and Land Area of Urbanized Areas for the United States: 1970 and 1960, Washington, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1979.

Average Speed: 19.6 mph.

Cold Start: 20.6%

Hot Start: 27.3%

CO Emissions Standard in 1981 and later LDV: 3.4 gms/mile

The above assumptions are in line with the set of assumptions in Appendix F of the EPA report, "Mobile Source Emissions Factors; Final Document," (EPA-400/9-78-005), March 1978. FMVCP annual reduction factors were developed for the four periods: 1976-1979, 1979-1982, 1982-1984, and 1984-1987. Although the validity of MOBILE 1-generated factors for 1979 and later years is not yet established, these were used as a best estimate. This aspect and a discussion of the CO emissions versus ambient temperature relationship is presented in Appendix E.

The following example is presented to explain the specific method to develop the annual reduction factors from the output of MOBILE 1 program. According to the output of MOBILE 1 program, the average fleetwide CO emissions per mile, considering all modes, for a temperature of 0°F and a low altitude region is:

119.67 gms/mile in 1976

111.94 gms/mile in 1979

84.98 gms/mile in 1982

66.49 gms/mile in 1984

46.16 gms/mile in 1987.

To develop the compounded annual reduction factor for the period 1976-1979, first calculate the ratio:

$$\frac{\text{Emissions/mile in 1979}}{\text{Emissions/mile in 1976}} = \frac{111.94}{119.67} = 0.93532$$

The period 1976-1979 spans 3 years, therefore calculate:

$$(0.93532)^{1/3} = 0.978$$

Then the compounded annual reduction factor for the period 1976-1979 (for temperature 0^{o} F, region low altitude) is calculated as:

$$1 - 0.978 = 0.022$$

The value 0.022 is the value that is stored in a table of of FMVCP factors included in the program. Factors for other temperatures, regions and time period were calculated in a similar manner and were stored in a table. Considering the fact that there are 10 values of temperatures (including 75°), 3 regions and 4 periods of time, there are 10x3x4 = 120 reduction factors stored in the FMVCP factor table. The FMVCP reduction factors are used in combination with VMT growth factors to estimate the projected line emissions for future years. For example, the 1979 line emissions for a county with 0° F temperature in low altitude with, say, an annual VMT growth factor of 2.8% is calculated as:

$$\text{1979 Line Emissions} = (\text{1976 line emissions}) \times (1+.028-.022)^{3}$$

It is to be noted that 1976 line emissions and VMT growth factors are available from the county file. Line emission calculations for other years are made in a similar manner.

- I/M Effectiveness Factors--The following example will be useful in explaining the meaning of I/M effectiveness factors as stored in the program:

  Suppose the average CO emissions/mile in 1987 as given by MOBILE 1 , considering only the FMVCP program, is 46.16 gms/mile (see example above). Suppose also that the average CO emissions/mile in 1987 as given by MOBILE 1, considering an I/M program with a stringency factor of 20% initiated in 1982, in addition to FMVCP, is 36.18. Then the ratio 36.18/46.18 = 0.784 is defined as the I/M effectiveness factor for a program with 20% stringency factor and initiated in 1982. Factors calculated in the above manner are stored in the I/M effectiveness table.

  The I/M factors were developed by SRI using the MOBILE 1 program assuming no mechanics training and with other assumptions similar to those for MOBILE 1 runs for FMVCP factors. Also, the I/M programs were assumed to be applicable to light-duty vehicles only. Three locations, i.e., low altitude, high altitude and California, were considered. The temperature increments were in 10° as for FMVCP calculations (including 75°F). Three stringency levels, i.e., 20%, 30%, and 40%, and 5 time periods were considered, namely:

I/M started in	Consider the effect in
1982	1984
1982	1987
1983	1984
1983	1987
1984	1987.

Thus, a total of: 3x10x3x5 = 450 I/M factors are stored in the program. Presently, only the factors associated with consideration of effects in 1987 are being used.

- Correction Factors for 1976 Line Emissions

The 1976 line emission values provided by EPA were based on a constant ambient temperature of 75°F. In order to make these values more realistic in terms of the effect of temperature, it was necessary to adjust these emissions corresponding to the county temperatures used for each county. Therefore, a table of correction factors was developed by SRI using the results of MOBILE 1 program. The following example explains how the correction factor was developed and used. Consider, a low altitude region. The 1976 CO emissions for various temperatures as given by MOBILE 1 are:

Temperature, °F	Emissions, gms/mile
0	119.67
10	109.30
:	:
:	:
50	83.11
75	74.32
80	72.98

The correction factor for a county with 0° F temperature will be $\frac{119.67}{74.32}$ = 1.610, i.e., the 1976 line emissions of this county, as originally provided by EPA, must be multiplied by 1.610 to get more realistic line emissions in 1976. Corrections factors for other temperatures and regions were calculated similarly and are stored in a table. With 3 regions and 10 levels of temperature, there are a total of 3x10=30 correction factors included in this correction table.

3.3 Input Data Related to Costs and Fuel Savings

- I/M-related costs and fuel savings--The following initial unit costs and fuel-saving factors were developed jointly by SRI and EPA, in consultation with the Inspection and Maintenance Staff, Emission Control Technology Division, EPA, Ann Arbor, Michigan. An explanation of the background and methodology to develop these cost factors is included in Appendix F.

  - Investment costs (capital costs) = $13.21/car
  - Inspection costs = $ 7.00/car
  - Repair costs = $22.00/car
  - Fuel Savings: (two cases) = a) no fuel savings
    b) no fuel savings in pre-1981 cars;
    7.5% saving/repaired car at 20% stringency (1981 and post-1981 cars);
    6% saving/repaired car at 30% stringency (1981 and post-1981 cars);
    4.5% saving/repaired car at 40% stringency (1981 and post-1981 cars)

- Percent of 1981 and post 1981 cars in the year 1987 = 78.1%

- Average yearly gas consumption = 430 gallons/car in 1987

The above-noted cost and gasoline-related factors can be changed without much difficulty if more accurate data becomes available.

- TCM-Related Costs and Fuel-Savings--As was the case with I/M costs and fuel savings, the following TCM-related initial costs and fuel-saving factors were developed jointly by SRI and EPA. An explanation of the background and methodology to develop these cost factors is included in Appendix F.

  - Maximum realizable reduction due to TCM = 5%.

  - The first 3% or less achievable, using localized TCM measures such as signal-timing optimatization, at an average cost of $170/ton of CO reduction.

  - Another 1% or less achievable, using areawide TCM measures such as ride-sharing, at an average cost of $400/ton reduction.

  - The last 1% or less achievable, using areawide TCM measures such as public transit improvements, at an average cost of $9200/ton reduction.

  - Fuel savings due to TCM is assumed to be 1088 gallons per ton of CO reduction.

  The above-noted percentages and cost factors can be changed easily if more reliable data becomes available.

- Gasoline Cost--has been assumed to be $1.00 per gallon using 1979 as the reference year. Again, this value can be easily changed if so desired.

4. SPECIFIC ASSUMPTIONS AND CALCULATION PROCEDURES

Specific assumptions and methods of calculations are explained in this section with references to a sample output for a county and a summary report.

4.1 County-Related Analysis

First consider a sample output for Los Angeles County shown in Figure 4.1. This output presents the analysis of Los Angeles County with reference to 8-hour daily maximum standard of 10 mg/m^3 (9ppm). Assumptions and procedures to produce various numerical results and statements are explained below:

- FIPS Code "06037", county name "Los Angeles", state code "CA"--are reproduced from the county file.
- Region "California", temperature "50°degrees, design value "27.9"--are reproduced from the county file.
- Rollback=64 --is calculated by the program using the relationship:

$$\text{Rollback} = \frac{\text{Design Value - Value of Standard}}{\text{Design Value - Background level}} \times 100$$

$$= \frac{27.9 - 10}{27.9 - 0} \times 100 = 64$$

In this particular run, the background value of the county in the county file was zero and the user did not specify any general background value either. As such, the program assumed the background level to be zero.

Reproduced from best available copy.

06037 LOS ANGELES , CA 09/06/79 PAGE 9

ANALYSIS FOR 8-HOUR DAILY MAXIMUM OF 10 MG/M3 (9 PPM).

CALIFORNIA 50 DEGREES

STANDARD = 10 DESIGN VALUE = 27.9 ROLLBACK = 64

MAX STRINGENCY : 30%
VMT ANNUAL GROWTH RATE : 1.20 %
ANNUAL AREA EMISSION GROWTH RATE BASED ON POPULATION
EFFECTIVENESS : 20% AREA, 0% POINT, 100% LINE
MOBIL 1 THRESHHOLD TEMP : DEGREES, FACTOR : 1.0

MOBILE SOURCE PROBLEM IN 1982
MOBILE SOURCE PROBLEM IN 1984
MOBILE SOURCE PROBLEM IN 1987

EMISSIONS	<---------- ACTUAL ---------->					<---------- EFFECTIVE ---------->				
	AREA	POINT	LINE	TOTAL	% REDUCTION	AREA	POINT	LINE	TOTAL	% REDUCTION
1979	239,281	20,891	2,832,566	3,092,738		47,856	0	2,832,566	2,880,422	
1982	245,926	22,932	2,220,101	2,488,959	20	49,185	0	2,220,101	2,269,286	21
1984	249,697	24,239	1,858,724	2,132,661	31	49,939	0	1,858,724	1,908,664	34
1987	255,454	26,145	1,519,322	1,800,922	42	51,090	0	1,519,322	1,570,413	45

TOTAL ALLOWABLE EMISSIONS : 1,032,499

NEEDED REDUCTIONS	TOTAL	LINE %
1982	1,236,877	55.7
1984	876,254	47.1
1987	538,003	35.4

I/M	AUTOMOBILES	STRINGENCY	TONS REDUCED	TONS %	I/M PROGRAM START
1987	6,012,535	30	309,941	20.3	1982

ESTIMATED INITIAL I/M INVESTMENT COST = $39,712,795

I/M COSTS	INSPECTION	REPAIR	TOTAL	FUEL SAVED	$ VALUE	NET I/M COST
1987	21,043,873	19,841,366	40,885,239	18,172,707	18,172,707	22,712,532

LOCAL TCM	TONS REDUCED	% REDUCED	ANNUAL COSTS	AREA TCM	TONS REDUCED	% REDUCED	ANNUAL COSTS
1987	45,579	3.0	7,748,543	1987	30,386	2.0	148,893,580

TCM FUEL SAVINGS	FUEL SAVED	$ VALUE	NET TCM COST	TOTAL TONS	NET TOTAL COST	REMAINING NEEDED REDUCTION
1987	82,651,130	82,651,130	73,990,993	385,907	96,703,526	10% 152,095 TONS

FIGURE 4.1 SAMPLE OF ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY

- Maximum stringency: 30%, VMT annual growth rate: 1.20%

  MOBILE 1 threshold temperature: degrees, factor: 1.0--are general input parameters (not county-specific) specified by the user for this particular run and are reprinted for convenient reference. The specific calculations where these input parameters are used are discussed below.

- Mobile Source Problem in 1982, 1984, and 1987--These statements are established after certain analyses are completed as discussed below.

- Actual Emissions 1979--The actual 1979 area and point emissions are reproduced from the county file. However, the 1979 line emissions are calculated by the program using the 1976 line emissions that are available in the county file as follows:

  1979 Line Emissions = (1976 Line Emissions) x (temperature correction factor) x (1 + VMT growth factor - FMVCP reduction Factor)^3.

  The VMT growth factor in this particular run was externally specified by the user to be 1.2%. Therefore the VMT growth factor in the county file is disregarded and the value specified by the user is used. The FMVCP factor is selected from the FMVCP factor table corresponding to 50°, California region, and 1976/1979 time period. The temperature correction factor is also suitably selected from the correction factor table. For this particular run:

  1976 Line Emission for Los Angeles = 3,126,330 tons (from county file)

Temperature Correction Factor = 1.112 (from correction factor table)

VMT Growth Factor = .012 (specified by user)

FMVCP Reduction Factor = 0.078 (from FMVCP factor table)

$\therefore$ 1979 Line Emissions = 3126330 x 1.112 x $(1 + .012 - .078)^3$ = 2,832,566 tons.

- Actual Emissions 1982, 1984 and 1987

  - Area Emissions. If the user specifies a general (not county-specific) yearly area emission growth rate, say x%, then the area emissions for 1982, 1984 and 1987 are calculated as follows:

    1982 Area Emissions = (1979 Area Emissions) x $[(100 + x)/100]^3$

    1984 Area Emissions = (1982 Area Emissions) x $[(100 + x)/100]^2$

    1987 Area Emissions = (1984 Area Emissions) x $[(100 + x)/100]^3$

  However, if the user does not specify any growth rate, the program uses a default formula based on population as follows:

  $$\text{1982 Area Emissions} = (\text{1979 Area Emissions}) \left(\frac{\text{1982 population}}{\text{1979 population}}\right)$$

  Similarly, calculations are performed for 1984 and 1987 emissions. The 1979, 1982, 1984 and 1987 population is calculated internally by referring to the population of 1970, 1980, 1985, and 1990, which is available in the county file. For example:

  $$\text{1979 population} = (\text{1970 population}) \times \left(\frac{\text{1980 population}}{\text{1970 population}}\right)^{9/10}$$

$$1982 \text{ population} = (1980 \text{ population}) \times \left(\frac{1985 \text{ population}}{1980 \text{ population}}\right)^{2/5}$$

and so on.

In the sample output the future area source emissions are population proportional as indicated on the upper right corner.

-Point Emissions. If the user has not specified any point emission growth factor, then the future year point emissions are calculated as follows:

1982 point emissions = 1979 point emissions x 1.0977

1984 point emissions = 1979 point emissions x 1.1603

1987 point emissions = 1979 point emissions x 1.2515

The factors 1.0977, 1.1603 and 1.2515 were developed by SRI based on projected national total manufacturing income. The user may specify other suitable values.

-Line Emissions. The line emissions for 1982, 1984, and 1987 are calculated in a manner similar to that explained above with reference to 1979 emissions. However, the temperature correction factor is not used for 1982, 1984, or 1987 calculations because the base emissions used for calculations for 1982 and other future years is that of 1979, which is already a corrected value for temperatures. For example:

$$1982 \text{ Line Emissions} = (1979 \text{ line emissions}) \times (1 + \text{VMT growth factor} - \text{reduction factor})^3$$

and so on.

- Actual Percent Reductions--These are calculated by subtracting the

total 1982, 1984 and 1987 emissions from the total 1979 emissions and expressing it as a percentage of 1979 emissions.

- Effective Emissions--The various emission sources differ in effectiveness in producing the CO concentrations recorded at monitoring locations. For example, only 20% of the total area source emissions might be the real contributor to the CO concentration levels in the urban areas since area emission sources are scattered over a large area. Similarly, point source emissions are usually located away from urban areas and their emissions are contained in a small area. Thus, for urban CO concentration levels the contribution from point source emissions may be negligible. On the other hand, the line emissions contribute directly to urban CO concentrations. The program is designed to provide the flexibility to the user in choosing different effectiveness factors for different emission sources. In the example printout the user had specified a 20% effectiveness factor for area source emissions, a 0% effectiveness factor for point emissions and a 100% effectiveness for line emissions. (See the statements on upper right corner of Figure 4.1.) Thus, the effective area source emissions are obtained by multiplying the actual emissions by a factor 0.2. The effective point emissions are all zero since effectiveness is 0. The line emissions are the same as actual because the effectiveness factor is 100%. The effective total emissions are the summation of effective area, point, and line emissions.

- Effective Percent Reductions--These are calculated in the same manner as actual percent reductions except that emission values are effective values.

- Total Allowable Emissions--These are calculated using the effective emissions of 1979 and the needed rollback as follows:

  (Total Effectiveness Emissions in 1979) x (1 - rollback expressed as a fraction)

  In the sample output: Allowable Emissions = 2,880,422 x $[1 - \frac{(27.9) - 10)}{27.9}]$ = 1,032,409 tons.

- Needed Reductions--These are calculated as follows:

  Needed Reductions 1982 = (Effective Total Emissions in 1982) - (Total Allowable Emissions)

  In the sample output: Needed 1982 reduction = 2,269,286 - 1,032,409= 1,236,877. Similar calculations are made for 1984 and 1987.

- Percent Line Reductions--It is assumed that the burden of reduction will be borne by line sources (i.e., automobiles). Thus, the needed percent reductions are calculated as a percent of effective line emissions in respective years. For example, in the sample output the 1982 line emissions are 2,220,101 and the needed reduction in 1982 is 1,236,877. Therefore, the percent line reduction needed is

  $$\frac{1,236,877}{2,220,101} \times 100 = 55.7\%.$$

  Similar calculations are made for other years.

- I/M 1987 Automobiles--The county car count of 1977 is available in the county file. It is assumed that the car count is linearly proportional to population. Thus, 1987 car count is calculated as:

$$1987 \text{ car count} = (1977 \text{ car count}) \times \frac{(1987 \text{ population})}{(1977 \text{ population})}$$

- 1987 Stringency, Tons Reduced, Tons Percentage, I/M Program Start--If an area cannot attain standards by 1982 (or 1984)*, the Clean Air Act (CAA) requires implementation of an I/M program to get an extension to 1987. This is the case even if the FMVCP alone is sufficient in 1987, though this affects the stringency of the I/M program. With the above-noted background, the logic of the program associated with these results is as follows:

  Case 1. The needed percent reductions in 1982/1984* are less than or equal to 5%.

  If the needed reductions in 1982/1984* are less than or equal to 5% and if the county already has an I/M program (see the discussion on I/M status code in Section 2), then the starting year of the I/M program is selected as 1982 and the stringency selected is 20%. The percent reduced (which is actually the percent reduction obtained by an I/M program) is obtained from the 1982-1987 I/M effectiveness factor table. The tons reduced by the I/M program are calculated by applying the above-noted percent to the line emissions of 1987. If there is no existing I/M program, the needed reductions are assumed to be accomplished through TCM.

---

*1982 for 1-hour 40 mg/m^3, 8-hour 10 mg/m^3, and 8-hour 14 mg/m^3 standards; 1984 for other standards.

Case 2. The needed percent reductions in 1982/1984 are greater than 5%.

If the needed percent reductions in 1982/1984 are greater than 5% and the county already has an I/M program, then the starting year of the I/M program is selected as before to be 1982. However, the selection of stringency is made on the basis of the percent reduction needed in 1987. If the needed percent reduction in 1987 is more than can be accomplished by an I/M program initiated in 1982 with maximum-allowable stringency, then the maximum-allowable stringency value is selected, and the still-remaining needed reduction is passed over to TCM. However, if the needed percent reduction can be accomplished with allowable levels of stringencies, then the smallest stringency that produces at least as much reduction as is needed is selected. If the county does not currently have an I/M program planned, but the state has one, then the I/M initiation year is selected to be 1983. If no plans for an I/M program currently exist, then the initiation year is assumed to be 1984. Other logic and procedures are the same as discussed above.

In the sample output, the needed reduction in 1982 is 55.7%, which is greater than 5%, i.e., Case 2 holds. The Los Angeles County has plans for an I/M program (see Appendix A). Therefore, I/M initiation year is 1982. The reduction needed in 1987 is 35.4%. The maximum-allowable stringency for this run is 30% (see the remarks in the upper right of Figure 4.1). The percent reduction

accomplished by 30% stringency is 20.3% (obtained from I/M effectiveness table) which is not sufficient. Therefore, the program selected the maximum-allowable stringency level of 30% since that is the highest allowable. Tons reduced are then calculated as:

= (1-I/M effectiveness factor) (Line Emissions in 1987)

= (1-0.796) (1,519,322) = 0.2204 x 1,519,322 = 309,941

The factor 0.796 is obtained from the I/M effectiveness factor table corresponding to 50°, California region, and 1982-1987 period. The tons % value of 20.3 is the ratio: $\frac{\text{Tons Reduced}}{\text{1987 line emissions}} \times 100$ which theoretically should be the same as: (1-0.796) x 100 = 20.4 (or 20.3 due to rounding).

- Estimated Initial I/M Investment Costs--These costs are calculated by multiplying the number of 1987 cars by the average value of I/M investment cost per car. I/M programs are planned for initiation in 1982 for both CO and O_3 as shown in Appendix A. As such, only one-half of the I/M costs are generally assigned to CO, and the rest are assumed to be for other pollutants. For I/M programs required to be initiated in 1983 or 1984, it is not yet certain whether these will be combined with other pollutants or not. As such, full I/M costs are assigned to CO for these programs. In the sample output for Los Angeles, the average investment cost per car is assumed to be $13.21 and the I/M program is assumed to start in 1982. Therefore, the I/M investment cost assigned to CO is:

6,012,535 x 13.21 x 1/2 = $39,712,795

- I/M Inspection and Repair costs--The inspection costs are calculated by multiplying the 1987 car count by the average value of I/M inspection cost per car. The repair cost is calculated by multiplying the number of repaired cars by the average repair cost/car. As was the case with investment costs, full inspection and repair costs are assigned to CO if the I/M program is initated in 1983 or 1984 and only half of the total inspection and repair cost are assigned to CO if the I/M program starts in 1982. In the sample output, the average inspection and repair costs were assumed to be $7 and $22 per car respectively, Therefore:

  Inspection cost = 6,012,535 x 7 x 1/2 = $21,043,873

  Repair cost = 6,012,535 x 0.3 x 22 x 1/2 = $19,841,366

  The number under the term "total" is the sum of inspection and repair costs.

- I/M Fuel Saved, $ Value and Net I/M Cost--

  I/M fuel savings are calculated assuming that 1) no fuel saving benefits occur in pre-1981 cars, 2) in 1981 and post-1981 cars the fuel savings is assumed to be 7.5% per repaired vehicle for 20% stringency factor, 6% per repaired vehicle for 30% stringency factor, and 4.5% for repaired vehicle for 40% stringency factor. The fraction of 1981 and post-1981 cars in the year 1987 was calculated to be 0.781. Thus:

  Fuel saving = (0.781) (1987 car count) x (average yearly gasoline consumption per car) x (stringency) x (fuel savings/repaired vehicle)

Average yearly gasoline consumption in 1987 is assumed to be 430 gallons/car and the average cost of gasoline is assumed to be $1.00/gallon as discussed in Appendix F. For I/M programs started in 1982, only one-half of the fuel savings and costs are assigned to CO. In the sample output, the stringency factor is 30% and the I/M program starts in 1982. Therefore:

Fuel saved = (0.781) x (6,012,535) x (430) x (.06 x 0.3) x 1/2 =
18,172,707 gallons

$Value = $18,172,707

The net I/M costs = (total inspection and repair costs) -
(cost of fuel saved due to I/M)
= 40,885,239 - 18,172,707 = $22,712,532

- TCM Costs, Fuel Savings and Fuel Costs--When percent reductions needed in 1982* (or 1984)* are either less than or equal to 5%, and when the county or the state does not have an existing I/M program, or when an I/M program cannot fully accomplish needed reductions, then a maximum of 5% emission reduction from TCM is assumed to be available. If the county has an existing I/M program, then even this 5% or less reduction is accomplished with the I/M program initiated in 1982 with a stringency factor of 20%. Up to 3% reduction is assumed to be available through local TCM strategies at a cost of $170/ton of CO reduction. Another 1% at $400/ton of CO reduction and finally the last 1% at $9,400/ton is assumed available due to areawide TCMs. These percentages and unit costs can, however

*1982 for 1-hour 40 mg/m^3, 8-hour 10 mg/m^3 and 8-hour 14 mg/m^3 standards; 1984 for other standards.

be easily changed since these are used as parameters.

Fuel savings due to TCM are calculated at a rate of 1088 gallons/ton of CO reduction. Also, refer to Appendix F for further explanation. Cost of fuel saved is calculated using an average value of $1.00/gallon though this unit cost can be easily changed.

In the example printout, the needed percent reduction of CO in 1987 is 35.4%. An I/M program using the maximum allowable stringency of 30% can accomplish a reduction of 20.3% only. Therefore, an additional reduction of 5% by local and areawide TCM was selected. Specifically:

Tons Reduced by Local TCM = .03 x 1,51',322 = 45,579 tons

Annual cost of Local TCM = 45,579 x $170 = $7,748,543

Tons Reduced by areawide TCM = (.01 x 1,519,322) + (.01 x 1,519,322)

= 15,193 + 15,193 = 30,386 tons.

Annual Cost of areawide TCM = (15,193 x 400) + (15,193 x $9,40))

= $148,893,580

TCM Fuel Savings = (45,579 + 30,386) x (1,088) = 82,651,130 gallons.

$ Value of fuel savings @ $1.00/gallon = $82,651,130

Net TCM Cost = TCM Costs - Cost of fuel saved due to TCM

= $7,748,543 + $148,893,580 - $82,651,130

= $73,990,993

- Total Tons and Net Total Costs

Total tons indicate the sum of CO reductions from both I/M and TCM programs. Net total costs indicate the sum of net I/M costs

and net TCM costs. In the example output results were:

Total tons = (309,941) + (45,579 + 30,386) = 385,907 tons

Net total = $22,712,532 + $73,990,993 = $96,703,526

- Remaining Needed Reductions

These are calculated as:

Remaining percent = (Needed percent reduction in 1987) -
(Total percent reductions due to I/M plus TCM)

In the sample printout,

Remaining percent = 35.4 - 20.3 - 5 = 10%

The remaining reduction in tons = (Needed reduction in 1987 in tons) -
(Total reduction in tons due to I/M and TCM)

= 538,003 - 385,907 = 153,095 tons

- Miscellaneous

1. The statements "Mobil source problem in 1982, 1984, etc." are printed on the basis of percent reduction accomplished considering only the FMVCP effects in combination with VMT growth factors. Referring to the sample output, it is seen that the effective percent reductions in 1982, 1984 and 1987 are 21%, 34% and 45% respectively. These are all less than the needed rollback percentage of 64%. Therefore, it is stated that in all these 3 years, there is a mobile source problem meaning that FMVCP is not sufficient to reduce CO emissions to the degree needed. In case the effective percent reductions are more than or equal to needed rollback percentage, a statement such as "FMVCP sufficient in 1984" is printed. However, even if FMVCP is sufficient in 1984 or 1987, an I/M program is still initiated because of CAA requirements

to obtain an extension from 1982 to 1987.

2. Threshold Temperature and Factor--As discussed in some detail in Appendix E, it is believed that I/M programs imposed in cold areas (defined as average temperature below 50°F) will be less effective in reducing total emissions than presently modeled by MOBILE 1. As temperature decreases, the emission during warm-up of the vehicle increases. As a result, the overall emissions in cold areas may not be reducible due to I/M to the extent assumed in MOBILE 1. Keeping the above-noted facts in view and in order to provide some flexibility in adjusting the I/M effectiveness factors based on test results and engineering judgement, two parameters have been provided in the program, namely a "threshold temperature value" and a "fraction". If, for example, the user specifies a threshold temperature of 50° and a factor of 0.5, then for all counties whose temperatures are less than 50° (i.e., 40°, 30° ...), the I/M effectiveness will be assumed to be 0.5 times that given by MOBILE 1. For temperatures greater than or equal to 50°, the I/M factors will not be changed.

In the example printout, the user has not specified any threshold temperature. In such a case, the program uses the I/M effectiveness factors, as given by MOBILE 1 without any adjustments.

4.2 Urban Area-Related Analysis and Summary Reports

Some additional analyses related to prespecified urban areas and analyses related to some useful summary tables are performed by an additional program that uses the results of the county analyses program. An explanation of the procedures and assumptions related to this additional

program is presented below with reference to typical sample output results.

4.2.1 Urban Area-Related Analyses

A list of specified urbanized areas and the names of counties belonging to each of the urban areas is shown in Appendix A. The general logic of urban area analyses is as follows.

If any county of an urbanized area needs an I/M program, the I/M program is assumed to be implemented in the entire urban area. The I/M costs are calculated using the sum of the vehicle population of all the counties included in the urban area. The stringency factor used is that of the county in the urbanized area with the highest stringency factor. If more than one county has the same highest stringency factor, then the first in the list is used as reference.

Referring to Figure 4.2, which show a typical output for an urban area analysis, the various numerical results are calculated as follows:

- Automobiles-- The projected 1987 car count of all counties included in the area is summed and printed in this column.
- Stringency--If more than one county of the urban area is in violation then the county using an I/M with the highest stringency factor is selected as the reference county. If only one county is in violation then the I/M stringency of this one county is used for the entire urban area. In this particular case only the San Francisco county was in violation of the standard and

*** STANDARD : 1-HOUR STATISTICAL STANDARD OF 17 MG/M3 (15 PPM).

URBANIZED AREA *	AUTOMOBILES	STRIN-GENCY (%)	INSPECTION ($)	REPAIR ($)	TOTAL ($)	URBAN REDUCTION (TONS)	I/M FUEL SAVED (GALLONS)	VALUE ($)	NET COST ($)
01	2,882,900	30	10,090,150	9,513,570	19,603,720	112,166	8,713,478	8,713,478	10,890,241
02	7,573,470	30	26,507,145	24,992,451	51,499,596	331,245	22,890,585	22,890,585	28,609,019
05	1,111,985	20	3,891,947	2,446,367	6,338,314	115,377	2,800,784	2,800,784	3,537,530
07	1,062,765	20	7,439,355	4,676,166	12,115,521	18,181	5,353,625	5,353,625	6,761,895
08	990,946	20	5,468,311	2,180,081	5,648,392	88,411	2,495,920	2,495,920	3,152,471
09	3,409,720	20	11,932,620	7,500,504	19,433,124	336,543	8,587,139	8,587,139	10,845,984
15	518,910	20	1,815,835	1,141,382	2,957,217	37,438	1,306,739	1,306,739	1,650,477
17	1,783,484	30	6,242,194	5,885,497	12,127,691	202,579	5,390,526	5,390,526	6,737,164
21	1,098,743	20	7,688,401	4,832,709	12,521,110	85,466	5,532,847	5,532,847	6,988,262
25	721,598	20	2,525,593	1,587,515	4,113,108	185,704	1,817,506	1,817,506	2,295,601
26	539,402	20	2,375,914	1,493,368	3,869,282	27,316	1,709,720	1,709,720	2,159,462
27	7,103,774	30	24,963,209	23,442,454	48,305,663	619,964	21,470,943	21,470,943	26,834,719
30	1,139,718	20	3,989,013	2,507,379	6,496,392	63,119	2,870,636	2,870,636	3,625,756
33	79,834	30	558,838	526,904	1,085,742	5,489	482,591	482,591	603,150
35	645,960	20	4,521,720	2,842,224	7,363,944	32,223	3,253,991	3,253,991	4,109,952
36	430,916	20	3,016,412	1,896,030	4,912,442	25,368	2,170,717	2,170,717	2,741,724
37	587,276	20	4,110,932	2,584,014	6,694,946	25,175	2,958,373	2,958,373	3,736,372
38	334,711	20	3,271,488	2,056,364	5,327,852	69,368	2,354,279	2,354,279	2,973,572
39	1,720,901	20	6,048,353	3,801,822	9,850,175	135,270	4,352,611	4,352,611	5,497,364
41	1,015,903	20	3,555,660	2,234,986	5,790,647	103,171	2,558,780	2,558,780	3,231,866
42	332,416	20	1,163,456	731,315	1,894,771	22,244	837,264	837,264	1,057,506
46	412,801	20	1,444,803	909,162	2,352,965	48,349	1,039,732	1,039,732	1,313,233
49	346,800	20	1,213,800	762,960	1,976,760	32,048	873,493	873,493	1,103,266
50	1,156,712	20	4,046,742	2,543,666	6,590,408	93,551	2,912,180	2,912,180	3,678,228
URBAN SUBTOTALS	37,407,445		145,781,791	113,087,890	258,869,681	2,866,665	114,734,459	114,734,459	144,135,205

FIGURE 4.2 SAMPLE OF URBAN AREA I/M ANALYSIS TABLE

*Names of actual urban areas have been intentionally blocked out because this table is to be treated purely as an example output.

an I/M with 30% stringency was selected for the county. Therefore, the stringency used for the entire urban area is 30%.

- I/M Inspection & Repair Costs; Fuel Savings & Fuel Costs

  The I/M inspection and repair costs as well as fuel savings and fuel costs for the urban areas are calculated using the same relationships as are used for counties, except that the car count used is that for an urban area instead of a county car count. Also, for areas with current plans for I/M programs, only half of the inspection and repair costs and fuel savings are assigned to CO. However, full costs and full fuel savings are assigned to CO for any urban area which does not have current plans for I/M programs.

- Urban Reduction (tons)--The urban CO reductions should theoretically be the summation of the CO reductions in the counties constituting the urban area. However, out of the 272 counties included in the county file, only 220 counties have design values and 1979 CO emission data. The data associated with the remaining 52 counties consists only of the car count in 1977 and the populations of the SMSAs or urban areas associated with these counties for the years 1970, 1980, 1985, and 1990. As such, the CO emissions and reductions in future years for these 52 counties is not calculable by the program. However, a reasonable estimate can be made by assuming that CO emissions of a county are roughly proportional to the car count of that county. This is the basic

assumption that has been used to calculate the urban reductions. Specifically, the following formula has been used:

$$\text{Urban Reduction} = \frac{\text{(Urban Car Count)}}{\text{(Car count of the county with highest stringency)}} \times \text{(Tons of CO reduced due to I/M in the county with highest stringency)}$$

For example, the output for San Francisco county, for a 1-hour 17 mg/m^3 statistical standard, shows a CO reduction of 17,327 tons in 1987 with an I/M using 30% stringency. The car count of San Francisco county in 1987 is 445,367, and the car count of San Francisco urban area is 2,882,900. Therefore:

$$\text{Urban Reduction for San Francisco Area} = \frac{2,882,900}{445,367} \times 17,327 = 112,166 \text{ tons}$$

Similar calculations are done for other urban areas.

- Urban Subtotals--These are the summations under each column of the urban analysis table.

4.2.2 Summary Tables

The program is designed to generate several useful summary tables for the user as explained below.

- I/M-Related Summary Data

Referring to Figure 4.3, a listing of all the individual counties (including those that are also single county urban areas) is printed along with I/M-related summaries of costs, fuel savings, and CO reductions. "County Subtotals" are the summation of numbers in respective columns. "Urban-County subtotals" are the summation of respective urban and county subtotals. The urban

*** STANDARD : 1-HOUR STATISTICAL STANDARD OF 17 MG/M3 (15 PPM).

Reproduced from best available copy.

RUN # 2 09/17/79 PAGE 8

INDIVIDUAL COUNTIES*	AUTOMOBILES	STRIN-GENCY (%)	INSPECTION ($)	REPAIR ($)	TOTAL ($)	REDUCTION (TONS)	I/M FUEL SAVED (GALLONS)	VALUE ($)	NET COST ($)
	29,900	30	209,304	197,344	406,648	2,837	180,747	180,747	225,901
	911,722	20	3,191,030	2,005,793	5,196,820	22,949	2,296,379	2,296,379	2,900,441
	284,125	20	994,434	625,079	1,619,513	9,185	715,633	715,633	903,880
	335,922	20	1,175,729	737,027	1,914,758	13,087	846,096	846,096	1,068,662
	1,202,490	20	4,208,715	2,645,478	6,854,193	42,683	3,028,741	3,028,741	3,825,452
	148,415	20	1,038,907	653,027	1,691,934	9,514	747,635	747,635	944,299
	89,777	20	628,440	395,019	1,023,459	7,598	452,248	452,248	571,211
	142,170	30	995,194	938,326	1,933,520	5,951	859,413	859,413	1,074,107
	222,752	20	1,556,466	978,350	2,534,816	17,002	1,120,088	1,120,088	1,414,728
	43,691	20	305,859	192,241	498,099	2,990	220,092	220,092	277,988
	338,451	20	1,185,278	744,032	1,930,310	10,433	852,968	852,968	1,077,342
	300,757	20	1,050,901	660,566	1,711,467	29,728	756,266	756,266	955,261
	128,536	20	899,755	565,560	1,465,315	11,928	647,496	647,496	817,919
	53,753	20	373,476	234,756	608,232	4,282	268,767	268,767	339,465
	46,909	20	328,367	206,402	534,769	2,098	236,304	236,304	298,465
	109,188	20	764,317	480,427	1,244,744	9,435	550,029	550,029	694,715
	12,859	20	90,015	56,581	146,596	844	64,778	64,778	81,818
	253,963	20	895,521	562,899	1,458,420	21,344	644,449	644,449	813,971
	27,487	20	192,413	120,945	313,358	2,498	138,467	138,467	174,991
	37,461	20	262,227	164,828	427,055	3,931	188,708	188,708	238,347
	295,467	20	1,034,137	650,029	1,684,166	21,811	744,202	744,202	939,964
	84,970	20	594,794	373,870	968,664	9,691	428,035	428,035	540,629
	192,832	20	674,912	424,230	1,099,142	18,597	485,691	485,691	613,451
COUNTY SUBTOTALS	5,294,797		22,650,175	14,615,804	37,265,979	300,414	16,473,232	16,473,232	20,792,747
URBAN-COUNTY SUBTOTALS	42,701,842		168,431,966	127,703,694	296,135,660	3,167,079	131,207,691	131,207,691	164,927,952

FIGURE 4.3 SAMPLE OF INDIVIDUAL COUNTIES I/M SUMMARY TABLE

*Names of actual counties and FIPS codes have been intentionally blocked out because this table is to be treated purely as an example output.

table shown in Figure 4.2, and the individual county I/M-related table shown in Figure 4.3 together constitute the complete summary of I/M-related analysis data for a particular study, i.e., for a 1-hour statistical standard of 17 mg/m^3.

- TCM-Related Summary Data--All those counties that used TCM either in addition to an I/M program or TCM alone are listed in Figure 4.4. The CO reductions, fuel savings, and net TCM costs are printed for each respective county. "TCM Subtotals" indicate the summation of numbers in various columns. "Grand Totals" indicate the sum of I/M urban, I/M individual counties, and TCM subtotals.

  The value indicated for "Net cost excluding I/M fuel savings" is: (Grand total - total costs of fuel saved due to I/M for both urban areas and individual counties).

- Summary Lists of Counties in Violation of Standards

  The following summary lists are produced.

  - Counties in violation in 1982 with FMVCP as the only control measure (for 1-hour standards of 40 mg/m^3, 8-hour standards of 10 mg/m^3 and 8-hour standards of 14 mg/m^3). These are all counties whose effective total percent reduction in 1982 is less than required rollback percent reduction.
  - Counties in violation with only FMVCP in 1984 (for all standards). These are all those counties whose effective percent

*** STANDARD : 1-HOUR STATISTICAL STANDARD OF 17 MG/M3 (15 PPM). RUN # 2 09/17/79 PAGE 9

COUNTIES NEEDING TCM*	REDUCTION (TONS)	FUEL SAVED (GALLONS)	NET COST ($)
	735	799,797	715,995
	74,183	80,711,624	72,254,708
	2,145	2,334,233	-1,969,509
	1,671	1,818,738	1,628,172
	3,836	4,174,320	-3,469,833
	2,342	2,548,660	-2,128,687
	9,084	9,884,088	8,848,439
	3,799	4,134,171	3,700,995
	436	475,451	-401,162
	2,013	2,190,928	1,961,364
TCM SUBTOTALS	100,244	109,072,010	81,140,482
GRAND TOTALS	3,267,323	240,279,701	246,068,434

NET COST EXCLUDING 1/4 FUEL SAVINGS = $ 377,276,142

FIGURE 4,4 SAMPLE OF SUMMARY TABLE OF COUNTIES NEEDING TCM

*See comments for Figure 4.3.

reduction in 1984 is less than required rollback percent reduction.

- Counties in violation with only FMVCP in 1987 (for all standards). These are all those counties whose effective total percent reduction in 1987 is less than the required rollback percent reduction.
- Counties in violation with FMVCP + I/M + TCM (for all standards). These are all those counties whose CO reductions in 1987 are less than the percent rollback needed even with FMVCP, I/M and TCM programs combined together. The remaining needed percent and tons are also printed along with the name of the counties.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF 272 COUNTIES AND URBAN AREAS WITH STATUS OF I/M PROGRAMS

Appendix A

LIST OF 272 COUNTIES AND URBAN AREAS WITH
STATUS OF I/M PROGRAMS

The following list of 272 counties potentially in violation of the existing and other proposed standards was selected as follows:

1. Started with the list of nonattainment areas as given in the Federal Register of March 3, 1978.

2. Added to this list those counties that showed design values that are equal to or greater than 80% of the current standard values. The design values were obtained from the Storage and Retrieval of Aerometric Data (SAROAD) reporting system.

3. Checked the emission densities of those counties for which no ambient concentration data exist and whose emission densities were greater than a cutoff value of 100 tons/sq. mile/year. Added the names of the counties whose emission densities were greater than the cutoff values to the list above.

4. Included all those counties that are part of the same urban area as those counties mentioned above.

The counties were then grouped into three categories, namely: 1) counties that are a part of multicounty urban areas which may cross state boundaries; 2) counties that are a part of a single county urban areas; and 3) counties not included in any urban area. The listing of urban areas and associated counties was derived from the report: Bureau of the Census, Population and Land Area of Urbanized Areas for the United States, 1970 and 1960, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce, 1979. The status of I/M programs for various counties was taken from the "Inspection/Maintenance Status Sheets", EPA, Ann Arbor, Michigan, May 29, 1979.

Referring to the list under the column headed, "Current Plans for I/M

Programs to be Initiated in 1982", the + mark(s) indicate that an I/M program is planned for initiation by July 1982 as required by EPA regulations for hydrocarbon control for the ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards. If there is no + mark against a county, but there is a + mark(s) for a county in the same state, it is assumed that the state has the legal authority for implementing an I/M program and the county can initiate an I/M program in 1983. If no county in the state has a + mark, then it is assumed that legal authority does not exist, and the earliest an I/M program can be initiated is in 1984.

LIST OF THE 272 COUNTIES AND URBAN AREAS WITH
STATUS OF I/M PROGRAMS

1. Counties Included in Multicounty Urban Areas

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs to be Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
1	California	San Francisco	Alameda	+	+
2			Contra Costa	+	+
3			Marin	+	+
4			San Francisco	+	+
5			San Mateo	+	+
6			Solano	+	+
7			Napa		
8		Los Angeles	Los Angeles	+	+
9			Orange	+	+
10		Sacramento	Placer	+	+
11			Sacramento	+	+
12			Yolo	+	+
13		San Bernardino	Riverside	+	+
14			San Bernardino	+	+
15	Colorado	Denver	Adams	+	+
16			Arapahoe	+	+
17			Denver	+	+
18			Jefferson	+	+
19	Delaware	Wilmington	New Castle		+
20			Salem, N.J.		+
21	Florida	Jacksonville	Clay		
22			Duval		
23	Georgia	Atlanta	Clayton	+	+
24			Cobb	+	+
25			DeKalb	+	+
26			Fulton	+	+

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs to be Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
27	Illinois	Chicago	Cook	+	+
28			Lake, Ill.	+	+
29			Lake, Ind.	+	+
30			Porter, Ind.	+	+
31			Tazewell		
32	Indiana	Indianapolis	Marion		
33			Hamilton		
34	Iowa	Davenport-Rock	Scott		
35			Rock Island		
36	Kentucky	Louisville	Jefferson	+	+
37			Clark, Ind.	+	+
38			Floyd, Ind.	+	+
39	Maryland	Baltimore	Baltimore City	+	+
40			Baltimore	+	+
41			Anne Arundel	+	+
42	District of Columbia	Washington, D.C.	Alexandria City, Va.		+
43			Arlington, Va.		+
44			Fairfax, Va.		+
45			Montgomery		+
46			Prince Georges		+
47			Washington D.C.		
48	Michigan	Detroit	Macomb	+	+
49			Oakland	+	+
50			Wayne	+	+
51	Minnesota	Minneapolis- St. Paul	Dakota		
52			Hennepin		
53			Ramsey		
54			Washington		
55			Carver		
56			Scott		
57			Anoka		

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs to be Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
58	Minnesota	St. Cloud	Benton		
59			Stearns		
60			Sherbourne		
61		Duluth-Superior	St. Louis		
62			Douglas, Wisc.		
63	Missouri	St. Louis	St. Louis City	+	+
64			St. Louis	+	+
65			St. Charles	+	+
66			Madison, Il.	+	+
67			St. Clair, Il.	+	+
68	Nebraska	Omaha	Douglas		
69			Sarpy		
70			Pottawattamie, Io.		
71	New York	New York City	Bronx	+	+
72			Kings	+	+
73			Nassau	+	+
74			New York	+	+
75			Queens	+	+
76			Richmond	+	+
77			Rockland	+	+
78			Suffolk	+	+
79			Westchester	+	+
80			Bergen, N.J.		+
81			Essex, N.J.		+
82			Hudson, N.J.		+
83			Middlesex, N.J.		+
84			Monmouth N.J.		+
85			Morris, N.J.		+
86			Ocean, N.J.		+
87			Passaic, N.J.		+
88			Somerset, N.J.		+
89			Union, N.J.		+
90		Albany-Schenectady	Albany		
91			Rensselaer		
92			Schenectady		
93		Buffalo	Erie		
94			Niagra		

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs to be Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
95	Ohio	Cleveland	Cuyahoga		+
96			Lake		
97		Cincinnati	Clermont		+
98			Hamilton		+
99			Boone, Ky.		
100			Campbell, Ky.		
101			Kenton, Ky.		
102		Youngstown	Mahoning		+
103			Trumbell		+
104		Steubenville	Jefferson		
105			Brook, W.Va.		
106			Hancock, W.Va.		
107		Toledo	Lucas		
108			Wood		
109		Dayton	Butler		
110			Greene		
111			Montgomery		
112		Akron	Portage		
113			Summit		
114	Oklahoma	Oklahoma City	Cleveland		
115			Oklahoma		
116	Oregon	Portland	Clackamas	+	+
117			Multnomah	+	+
118			Washington	+	+
119			Clark, Wa.	+	+
120	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	+	+
121			Bucks	+	+
122			Delaware	+	+
123			Burlington, N.J.		+
124			Camden, N.J.		+
125			Goucester, N.J.		+
126		Scranton-Wilkes	Lackawana		+
127			Luzerne		+
128		Pittsburg	Allegheny	+	+
129			Beaver	+	+
130			Westmoreland	+	+

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs to be Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
131	Pennsylvania	Allentown-Bethlehem	Lehigh		+
132			Northampton		+
133			Warren, N.J.		+
134	Rhode Island	Providence	Bristol	+	+
135			Kent	+	+
136			Providence	+	+
137			Washington	+	+
138	South Carolina	Columbia	Lexington		
139			Richland		
140	Tennessee	Chattanooga	Hamilton		
141			Catoosa, Ga.		
142			Walker, Ga.		
143	Utah	Salt Lake City	Davis	+	+
144			Salt Lake	+	+
145	Virginia	Richmond	Richmond City		
146			Chesterfield		
147			Henrico		
148		Norfolk	Chesapeake City		
149			Norfolk City		
150			Portsmouth City		
151			Virginia Beach City		
152	Washington	Seattle-Tacoma	King	+	
153			Pierce	+	
154			Snohomish	+	
155	Wisconsin	Milwaukee	Milwaukee		+
156			Ozaukee		+
157			Waukesha		+

2. Counties Included in Single County Urban Areas

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
158	Alabama	Birmingham	Jefferson		
159	Arizona	Phoenix	Maricopa	+	
160		Tucson	Pima	+	
161	California	Fresno	Fresno	+	+
162		Bakersfield	Kern	+	+
163		San Diego	San Diego	+	+
164		Stockton	San Joaquin		
165		Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	+	
166		San Jose	Santa Clara	+	+
167		Modesto	Stanislaus		
168		Santa Rosa	Sonoma		
169		Ventura	Ventura		+
170	Colorado	Boulder	Boulder		
171		Colorado Springs	El Paso	+	
172	Connecticut	Bridgeport	Fairfield		+
173		Hartford	Hartford		+
174		New Haven	New Haven		+
175		Waterbury	Litchfield		
176		Meriden	Middlesex		
177	Florida	Ft. Lauderdale	Broward		
178	Idaho	Boise	Ada		
179	Iowa	Cedar Rapids	Linn		
180		Des Moines	Polk		
181	Kansas	Wichita	Sedgwick		
182	Kentucky	Owensboro	Daviess		
183	Maine	Lewiston-Auburn	Androscoggin		
184	Michigan	Saginaw	Saginaw		

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
185	Minnesota	Rochester	Olmstead		
186	Missouri	Springfield	Greene		
187	Montana	Great Falls	Cascade		
188		Billings	Yellowstone		
189	Nebraska	Lincoln	Lancaster		
190	Nevada	Las Vegas	Clark	+	
191		Reno	Washoe	+	
192	New Hampshire	Manchester	Hillsborough		
193	New Jersey	Atlantic City	Atlantic		+
194		Trenton	Mercer		+
195	New Mexico	Albuquerque	Bernalillo	+	
196	New York	Syracuse	Onondaga		
197		Rochester	Monroe		
198	North Carolina	Charlotte	Mecklenburg	+	
199	Ohio	Columbus	Franklin		
200	Oklahoma	Tulsa	Tulsa		
201	Oregon	Eugene	Lane		
202		Salem	Marion		
203	Tennessee	Memphis	Shelby	+	
204		Nashville	Davidson	+	
205		Knoxville	Knox		
206	Texas	Houston	Harris		+
207		El Paso	El Paso		

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
208	Utah	Ogden	Weber	+	+
209		Provo	Utah		
210	Virginia	Newport News	Hampton		
211	Washington	Spokane	Spokane	+	
212		Yakima	Yakima		

3. Counties That Are Not in Urbanized Areas

213	Alabama	Mobile
214	Alaska	Anchorage
215		Fairbanks
216	California	Butte
217		Merced
218		Santa Cruz
219		Sutter
220		Tulare
221	Colorado	Larimer
222		Douglas
223		Weld
224	Connecticut	New London
225		Tolland
226	Florida	Dade
227		Hillsborough
228		Orange
229		Palm Beach
230		Pinellas
231		Volusia
232	Illinois	Peoria
233		Will
234	Kansas	Douglas
235		Shawnee
236		Wyandotte

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs Initiated in 1982 CO	Current Plans for I/M Programs Initiated in 1982 O_3
237	Kentucky		McCracken		
238	Louisiana		E. Baton Rouge		
239	Maine		Penobscot		
240	Maryland		Alleghany		
241			Washington		
243	Massachusetts		Central		
244			Pioneer		
245			Boston Met		
246	Michigan		Kent		
247	Montana		Missoula		
248	Nevada		Carson City		
249			Douglas		
250			Storey		
251	New Hampshire		Coos		
252			Merrimack		
253			Rockingham		
254	New Jersey		Cape May		+
255	New Mexico		Chaves		
256			Dona Ana		
257			San Juan		
258			Santa Fe		
259	North Carolina		Durham		
260	Ohio		Clark		
261			Stark		
262	Oregon		Jackson		

No.	State	Urban Area	Associated Counties	Current Plans for I/M Programs Initiated in 1982 CO	O_3
263	South Carolina		York		
264	Texas		Bexar		
265			Dallas		
266			Nueces		
267			Tarrant		
268			Travis		
269	Utah		Utah		
270	Vermont		Chittenden		
271	Virginia		Roanoke		
272	Wisconsin		Kenosha		

APPENDIX B

THE ALTERNATIVE CO STANDARDS INCLUDED IN THE PROGRAM AND THE BASIS FOR CALCULATING DESIGN VALUES

Appendix B

THE ALTERNATIVE CO STANDARDS INCLUDED IN THE PROGRAM AND THE BASIS FOR CALCULATING DESIGN VALUES

General

The current CO standards specify that the hourly average CO concentration must not exceed 40 mg/m^3 (approximately 35 ppm) more than once per year and that the 8-hour average CO concentration must not exceed 10 mg/m^3 (approximately 9 ppm) more than once per year. In addition to assessing alternative standard levels in the standard-setting regulatory analyses, EPA is also considering alternative procedures for calculating exceedances of the standard. These procedures affect the form of the standard.

In its current form, the standard is based on the second highest monitored value in an area during a year. However, this deterministic (once-per-year) approach has limitations in that it does not account for the probabilistic nature of maximum CO concentrations. For example, to maintain such a standard year after year necessitates a zero probability that the second high value will ever again exceed the standard. On a practical basis, permitting only a single absolute exceedance in a year means that there is some possibility of occasionally having two or more exceedances in a particular year.

The form of the standard not only influences the determination of the number of exceedances of the standard, but also affects the calculation of an area's design value. The design value represents the estimated ambient concentration from which emission reductions are calculated in the strategy

planning process.

The program is designed to evaluate the current 1-hour and 8-hour standard as well as six additional 1-hour and six additional 8-hour standards based on various levels and forms as shown in Table B-1. Brief discussions related to the statistical forms of the standards and calculation of corresponding design values are presented below.

Statistical Forms of the Standard

To remedy the logical conflict and to adjust for the effect of missing data, EPA is considering defining the standard on a statistical basis whereby the expected number of exceedances per calendar year is determined. Statistical forms of the standard vary, depending on whether all possible values are used or daily values alone, and how running averages are handled for the 8-hour standard.

For purposes of the analysis contained in this document, two interpretations of the statistical standard are used. For the 1-hour standard, the hourly interpretation bases the design value on the ambient hourly concentration which on the average will be exceeded once per year in each area. The daily interpretation on the other hand, bases the standard on the number of days with maximum hourly CO averages above the level of the standard. This means that a day with two or more hourly values over the standard level counts as one exceedance of the standard level rather than two or more.

Statistical forms of the 8-hour standard follow the same basic approach, but the interpretation is complicated by running averages, as discussed by EPA in "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Air Quality Data with Respect to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards," Guideline Series

Table B-1

THE 14 ALTERNATIVE CO STANDARDS INCLUDED IN THE PROGRAM

One-Hour Standards			Eight-Hour Standards		
Konometric (PPM)	SI Equivalent (mg/m3)		Konometric (PPM)	SI Equivalent (mg/m3)	
35	40	Annual Second High Existing	9	10	Annual Second High Existing
35	40	Statistical, on an annual maximum basis *	7	8	Statistical, on an annual maximum basis *
25	29		9	10	
15	17		12	14	
35	40	Statistical, on a daily maximum basis #	7	8	Statistical, on a daily maximum basis #
25	29		9	10	
15	17		12	14	

*Where the expected number of annual maximum exceedances is $\leq$ 1 per year.

#Where the expected number of daily maximum exceedances are $\leq$ 1 per year.

OAQPS 1.2-008, revised February 1977. The current CO standard is chosen so that the second exceedance does not come from an 8-hour period which contains at least 1-hour in common with the first exceedance.

In calculating design values for use in this analysis, the daily interpretation uses overlapping 8-hour averages in computing the expected number of exceedances. For each day, the highest of the 24 possible 8-hour averages is the daily maximum 8-hour average. With this method, the possibility arises that two daily exceedances could have common hourly values. The other statistical approach (the hourly interpretation) employed in this analysis uses all possible 8-hour averages for the year so that more than one exceedance per day could be counted. This is more stringent than the current form of the standard because exceedances may overlap.

Calculation of Design Values

Design values for use in this analysis were obtained from a review of 1976-1978 CO ambient air quality data in EPA's SAROAD data base. For the current form of the standard, the second highest maximum value was used. Using the three years of data, design values based on the respective statistical forms of the standard are expected to fall between the third and fourth highest maximum value, whether it be an hourly or daily value. In selecting design values, the fourth highest value over the three year period was used. If only two years of data were available, the third highest value was chosen. These design values are approximate and suitable only for analytical purposes in this assessment. In State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted to EPA, States will calculate the actual design values used for attainment determinations and for planning purposes. The values will be calculated based on guidance provided by EPA.

APPENDIX C

CONVERSION OF EMISSION DENSITY VALUES TO SURROGATE DESIGN VALUES

Appendix C

CONVERSION OF EMISSION DENSITY VALUES TO SURROGATE DESIGN VALUES

As indicated in Section 2 of this report, emission densities were used as design value surrogates for those counties not having design value data. As compatible surrogates for the various standards, equivalent emission densitites were calculated that would lead to a concentration equal to the standards under a certain set of conservative conditions. These were calculated as described below.

The Holzworth model* was used with a correction from Calder.# The basic model applies to a ground-level pollutant released from a rectangular urban area source distribution of uniform strength $Q(g/m^2\text{-sec})$. The width of the rectangle, 2B, is perpendicular to the wind direction and the downwind length is S. A rectangular coordinate system is used with x along the wind direction and the origin at the center of the upwind edge of the rectangle. The concentration $\chi(x,o,o)$ at ground level and downwind distance x along the center line of the area is then given by

---

*Holtzworth, G.C., Mixing Heights, Wind Speeds, and Potential for Urban Air Pollution Throughout the Contiguous United States, EPA Report No. AP-101.

#Calder, K.L., "A Correction to the Holzworth Model of Meteorlogical Potential for Urban Air Pollution," Atmospheric Environment, Vol. 11, pp. 761-764, 1977.

$$\chi(x,o,o) = \int_{o}^{x}\int_{-B}^{B} \frac{Q}{\pi\sigma(x-x_o)\sigma_z(x-x_o)U} \exp\left(\frac{-Y_o^2}{2\sigma_y^2\,(x-x_o)}\right) dx_o dy_x \qquad (1)$$

where U is the average wind speed and is assumed constant throughout the region. If the half-width of this hypothetical point source plume is less than the crosswind half-width, B, of the source area, then (1) may be closely approximated by setting $B = \infty$. Then (1) reduces to

$$\chi(x,o,o)=\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{Q}{U}\int_{o}^{x} \frac{dx_o}{\sigma_z(x-x_o)} \qquad (2)$$

This relationship is valid provided that vertical dispersion is not restricted. For a mixing height, H, there is a critical distance, X, that occurs when $\sigma_z(X)=0.8H$. Complete vertical mixing is assumed to occur beyond this distance and the concentration maintains a constant value in the vertical direction. Expressing the vertical dispersion coefficient as a power law relation

$$\sigma_z(x) = ax^b$$

the concentration at a point x beyond the critical distance may be expressed as

$$\chi(x,o,o) = \frac{QX}{UH(1-b)} + \frac{Q(x-X)}{UH} \quad \text{for } x > X \qquad (3)$$

A number of conservative assumptions were used to calculate "standard-equivalent" emission densities from this relationship. These included:

region size, S = 100 km

mixing height, H = 125 m

wind speed, U = 1 m/sec

stability class = E

downwind distance, x = S = 100 km

Values for a and b were chosen from the power law formulation of the vertical dispersion coefficient in APRAC-1A for E stability:

$$a = 1.35$$

$$b = 0.51$$

Using these assumptions,

$$\sigma_z(X) = 1.35X^{0.51} = (0.8)\ 125,$$

and $X = 4635$ m.

Then

$$\frac{\chi U}{Q} = \frac{4635}{125(1-0.51)} + \frac{10^5-4635}{125}$$

$$= 838.6$$

Since U is assumed to be 1 m/sec,

$$\frac{\chi}{Q} = 838.6 \text{ sec/m},$$

or

$$Q = \chi/838.6 \text{ sec/m}.$$

With χ expressed in mg/m^3, Q may be expressed in $tons/mi^2$-yr by

$$Q = \left(\frac{\chi}{836.6}\right) \frac{1}{1.11 \times 10^{-5}} \quad \frac{\text{tons/mi}^2\text{-yr}}{\text{mg/m}^2\text{-sec}} \qquad (4)$$

and $Q = 107.43\chi$ tons/mi^2-yr. The "standard-equivalent" emission densities were calculated using equation (4).

The table below lists the different standards and the associated emission densities.

Standard (mg/m^3)	Emission Density (tons/mi^2-yr)
40	4296
29	3115
17	1826
14	1504
10	1074
8	859

These emission densities were used for both the second high and the statistical forms of the standards because the assumed conditions were taken to occur frequently enough to apply to the different forms.

APPENDIX D

ORIGINAL COUNTY AREAWIDE VMT GROWTH FACTORS

Appendix D

ORIGINAL COUNTY AREAWIDE VMT GROWTH FACTORS*

State	Urbanized Area	Compound Annual Percentage Change
Alabama	Birmingham	5.20
	Mobile	3.12
Arizona	Phoenix	2.89
	Tucson	2.49
Arkansas	Little Rock	3.97
California	Fresno	4.18
	Los Angeles	3.16
	Oxnard	5.10
	Sacramento	4.12
	San Bernadino	4.25
	San Diego	4.78
	San Francisco	3.80
	San Jose	4.24
Colorado	Colorado Springs	2.99
	Denver	3.67
Connecticut	Bridgeport	1.85
	Hartford	1.89
	New Haven	1.79
Delaware	Wilmington	3.73
District of Columbia	Washington, D.C.	1.98
Florida	Fort Lauderdale	2.71
	Jacksonville	2.54
	Miami	2.48

*Source: Program Management Division, FHWA, National Functional System Mileage Travel Summary, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C., 1977.

State	Urbanized Area	Compound Annual Percentage Change
Florida	Orlando	3.24
	St. Petersburg	1.92
	Tampa	3.16
	W. Palm Beach	3.73
Georgia	Atlanta	4.52
	Columbus	3.80
Hawaii	Honolulu	2.18
Illinois	Chicago	1.20
	Peoria	2.54
	Rockford	1.85
Indiana	Fort Wayne	2.85
	Indianapolis	3.15
	South Bend	3.29
Iowa	Davenport	2.57
	Des Moines	2.84
Kansas	Wichita	1.93
Kentucky	Louisville	3.01
Louisiana	Baton Rouge	3.42
	New Orleans	3.14
	Shreveport	3.39
Maryland	Baltimore	2.98
Massachusetts	Boston	2.44
	Lawrence	2.36
	Springfield	2.47
	Worcester	2.46
Michigan	Detroit	3.86
	Flint	4.24
	Grand Rapids	1.93
	Lansing	3.30
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.80
Missouri	Kansas City	1.67
	St. Louis	1.71
Nebraska	Omaha	2.69

State	Urbanized Area	Compound Annual Percentage Change
Nevada	Las Vegas	1.80
New Jersey	Trenton	2.61
New Mexico	Albuquerque	2.64
New York	Albany	2.20
	Buffalo	2.20
	New York	2.39
	Rochester	2.88
	Syracuse	2.20
North Carolina	Charlotte	3.15
Ohio	Akron	1.75
	Canton	2.31
	Cincinnati	2.20
	Cleveland	2.24
	Columbus	2.29
	Dayton	2.34
	Toledo	2.04
	Youngstown	2.09
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City	3.34
	Tulsa	2.75
Oregon	Portland	3.08
Pennsylvania	Allentown	1.80
	Harrisburg	1.88
	Philadelphia	1.94
	Pittsburg	2.00
	Scranton	1.38
Rhode Island	Providence	0.76
South Carolina	Charleston	4.22
	Columbia	4.37
Tennessee	Chattanooga	5.26
	Memphis	3.64
	Nashville	4.21
Texas	Austin	3.53
	Corpus Christi	3.04
	Dallas	4.35
	El Paso	3.70

State	Urbanized Area	Compound Annual Percentage Change
Texas	Houston	3.85
	San Antonio	3.34
Utah	Salt Lake City	3.88
Virginia	Newport News	4.79
	Norfolk	2.80
	Richmond	4.12
Washington	Seattle	3.05
	Spokane	2.73
Wisconsin	Madison	1.76
	Milwaukee	1.46

APPENDIX E

MOBILE SOURCE CO EMISSIONS VERSUS AMBIENT TEMPERATURE

Appendix E

MOBILE SOURCE CO EMISSIONS VERSUS AMBIENT TEMPERATURE

General

During vehicle operation at cold ambient temperatures, emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) increase over the levels emitted at the moderate ambient temperature range (68°F to 86°F, nominally 75°F) of the official Federal Test Procedure (FTP). The increased CO emissions are primarily emitted during the cold-start portion of vehicle operation. The cold-start portion is the portion of vehicle operation before emission-important vehicle and control system temperatures have reached nominal values. CO emissions are high during the cold-start portion of vehicle operation because the engines typically operate with rich air/fuel mixtures, which increase the CO produced by the engine. Secondly, after-treatment systems, such as catalysts, are operating at a lower temperature than is required for efficient conversion of the CO emissions from the engine. Thirdly, engine and drivetrain friction is higher during the cold-start portion of vehicle operation and to overcome this extra friction the mass throughput of the engine must be higher, which also increases the mass emissions.

MOBILE 1 , the computer program used in this study, accounts for the increase in CO emissions as ambient temperature decreases. There are four different classes of vehicles which were used to model the emissions versus temperature relationship given in MOBILE 1: (1) pre-1968 model

year and earlier vehicles, (2) 1968-1974 model-year vehicles, (3) 1975 model-year non-California vehicles, and (4) 1975 model-year California vehicles. Each class of vehicles has its own CO versus temperature adjustment factor curve.

Special attention must be drawn to the CO versus temperature adjustment curves for the 1975 and later model-year category. The data that were used to generate the relationship used in MOBILE 1 came primarily from 1975 model-year vehicles. Since technology for the 1975-1979 model year vehicles did not change substantially, the relationship of the 1975 model year federal vehicles is assumed applicable through 1979. For 1980 and later models, the relationship of the 1975 model-year California vehicles was used. However, the emission control technology that will be used on future model-year vehicles (especially those for model-year 1981 and later) is expected to be substantially different from that used on the 1975 model-year California vehicles. Therefore, it is also possible that the CO versus temperature behavior of the future vehicles could also be substantially different.

Because of the sophisticated nature of the future systems, the possibility exists that the CO versus temperature relationship could be relatively worse or relatively better than is estimated by MOBILE 1. This introduces some uncertainty into this analysis. EPA is conducting studies to improve the estimates of the CO versus temperature effect for future vehicles, but these studies are not complete at this time. In order to perform this analysis, the MOBILE 1 projections were used as a best-estimate. It must be pointed out that the use of the MOBILE 1 estimates is tantamount to making the assumption that the automobile industry

will consider lower temperature CO emissions in the design of future vehicles, at least to the extent needed to maintain the same relative relationship in CO versus temperature that existed with the 1975-1979 vehicles, even though the FTP CO emissions of the future vehicles will be much lower than those of the 1975-1979 models.

I/M- Related Issues

In the analysis of inspection and maintenance (I/M) as a control strategy for CO, the MOBILE 1 computer model of mobile source emissions was used as the basic tool for calculating I/M's effectiveness. Although the I/M effectiveness estimates provided in MOBILE 1 are EPA's best estimates, they represent standard FTP conditions. Included in the standard FTP conditions is an average ambient temperature of 68° to 86°F, nominally 75°F.

On the basis of monitoring data, it appears that most violations of the current ambient CO standard occur in a temperature range of 30° to 50°, which is somewhat lower than the 68° to 86°F range of the FTP. There are very few data on I/M's effectiveness in cold temperatures. However, colder temperatures imply that a vehicle will experience more cold operation than would occur at 75°, and, therefore, higher CO emissions. This is the case no matter what the vehicles's state of tune. Limited data from EPA's FY77 Emission Factor Program suggest that CO cold-start emissions from "as-received" vehicles are incrementally higher, not proportionately higher, than those from the tuned-up vehicles.

MOBILE 1 models emission reduction from I/M to be a constant percent no matter what the temperature and no matter what the percent of cold

operation. In view of the information presented above, it was decided to use a range of I/M effectiveness for cases of CO violations that are modeled to occur below 50°F. This selection of 50°F is based on engineering judgment and is intended to divide the temperature range into two parts: one in which primarily FTP temperature conditions occur, and one which represents colder temperature conditions.

For modeling cases with ambient temperatures lower than 50°F, two calculations of I/M effectiveness were performed:

1. 100% of the effectiveness modeled in MOBILE 1.
2. 50% of the effectiveness modeled in MOBILE 1.

It is felt that 50% of the effectiveness modeled in MOBILE 1 represents a lower limit estimate of I/M's effectiveness for temperatures down to 20°F. The 50% estimate is based on data from EPA's Portland study, where cold operation CO percent reductions on failed cars were about 50% of the CO-percent reductions over the entire FTP.

APPENDIX F

ASSUMPTIONS AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO COST AND FUEL SAVING FACTORS IN I/M & TCM PROGRAMS

Appendix F

ASSUMPTIONS AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO
COST AND FUEL SAVING FACTORS IN I/M & TCM PROGRAMS

I/M Programs

Estimation of Capital Costs

Estimation of capital costs of an I/M program for a given county or area has been calculated as the product of the following two variables:

1. N_{1987} = The estimated population of vehicles N_{1987}, to be inspected yearly in the year 1987.

2. P_c = Average capital cost of an I/M program per vehicle.

N_{1987}: Starting with the number of vehicles in the year N_{1977}, and the population P_{1977} in the year 1977, the number of vehicles is 1987 is assumed to increase with the same rate as population.

Thus,

$$N_{1987} = \frac{N_{1977}}{P_{1977}} \times P_{1987} \qquad (1)$$

P_c : P_c is composed of three factors, namely:

P_1 = portion of capital for land
P_2 = portion of capital for construction
P_3 = portion of capital for other investment and administration startup costs.

Unfortunately, the values of P_c or P_1, P_2, P_3 are not available directly in the literature. However in the document "Questions and Answers Concerning the Technical Details of Inspection and Maintenance," dated April 1979, issued by The Inspection and Maintenance Staff, Emission Control Technology Division, Office of Mobile Source Air Pollution Control, Office of Air, Noise and Radiation, U.S. EPA, Ann Arbor, Michigan, the following annualized costs of capital and depreciation periods are given in Table A, page 24 (for a typical contractor-operated I/M program using idle emissions inspection).

Part	Annualized Cost/ per Vehicle	Depreciation Period
Land	0.30	No Depreciation
Construction	0.61	20 Years
Other Investment	0.62	5 Years
Administrative Startup	0.31	5 Years

It is also stated that the assumed net return income is 8% (page 22). Using the above noted information, the initial capital cost for each of the parts was calculated by the formula

$$R = P\left[\frac{i(1+i)^n}{(1+i)^n-1}\right] \qquad (2)$$

where R = Equivalent annual cost of capital
P = Initial capital cost
n = Service life (depreciation period)
i = Net rate of return

Note that for very large n (no depreciation), R = Pi; thus:

The initial capital cost for land = $\frac{0.3}{0.08}$ = \$3.75 per vehicle.

Now:

The initial capital cost for construction = $o.61\left(\frac{(1.08)^{20}-1}{.08\ (1.08)^{20}}\right)$ =

= \$5.98 per vehicle

The initial capital cost for other investment plus administrative startup = $(0.62 + .31)\left[\frac{(1.08)^5-1}{.08\ (1.08)^5}\right]$

= \$3.48

Thus, the total initial capital cost P_c = 3.75 + 5.98 + 3.48 = \$13.21

This is the cost factor that has been used initially in the program. However, it can easily be changed since it is treated as an input parameter.

Inspection Costs

Currently, the inspection costs range from \$2.50 to \$14.00 per car. However, many I/M programs are coupled with safety inspection or have other features. Referring to Table A, page 24, of the above-noted question-answer document issued by EPA, Ann Arbor, values of inspection fees to cover the annualized investment and annual operating costs have been estimated to be \$6.87 for state-operated I/M programs, \$7.36 for contractor-operated programs, and \$8.54 for decentralized programs. Based on these estimates, an average inspection cost of \$7 per car has been used initially in the program. This value can be changed easily since it is

treated as an input parameter.

I/M Repair Cost

Again, the above-noted document has been used as a reference. Page 2 of this document gives average maintenance (repair) cost for various stringency factors. However, the range of costs is not too large. As such an average repair cost of $22/car has been assumed irrespective of stringency factors. Again this cost factor has been treated as a parameter that can easily be changed.

Potential Fuel Economy From I/M

Data from the Portland study indicated repaired vehicles with current emission control technology are not exhibiting fuel economy improvements. Thus, as a worst case, the assumption is made that no repaired cars will experience a fuel economy benefit. However, based on a theoretical assessment of future emission control technology, EPA believes that future vehicles will most likely experience a fuel economy benefit as a result of I/M repairs. Hence, an alternative case is analyzed whereby the fuel savings per repaired vehicle is assumed to be 7.5% with 20% stringency, 6% with 30% stringency, and 4.5% with 40% stringency for 1981 and post-1981 cars. The percentage of 1981 and post-1981 cars in the years 1987 is estimated to be 78.1% based on historical trends.

The average yearly gasoline consumption in 1987 was estimated to be 430 gallons. This is SRI's estimate based on the Energy Act of 1975 as well as an estimated population mix of vehicles in various years. The Energy Act mandates an average of 20 mpg by 1980 and 26-27.5 mpg by 1985. It was estimated that due to various mixes of car ages, the average mpg in 1982 will be 17, in 1984 it will be 19, and in 1987 it will be 22. Assuming an average yearly mileage of 9,400 miles/car, the yearly gasoline consumption in 1987 is calculated to be

$$\frac{9400}{22} \simeq 430 \text{ gallons.}$$

TCM Programs

General

Based on the study of readily available literature* as well as based on

*Refer to SRI International's report, "Assessment of Mobile Source Control Strategy Cost Effectiveness," dated June 1979, prepared under EPA contract No. 68-02-2835, available from EPA through Ambient Standards Branch (MD-12). This report presents a summary of cost information available in recent literature as well as several references.

on consultations with EPA, it is assumed that TCM programs can accomplish a maximum of up to 5% reduction in CO emissions--3% by local TCM strategies and 2% by areawide TCM strategies. However, it is to be noted that almost all of the TCM programs are primarily implemented to improve the transit operations and conserve energy. The reductions in CO and other pollutants are usually cited as additional advantages. As such, it is misleading to allocate the total costs of implementing a TCM program to either traffic improvement or energy savings or to pollution reduction, although a major portion should be allocated to transit operation improvements and energy savings. However, since no clearly stated rules of allocating the costs to various consequences are presently available, the cost per VMT reduction of various programs have been converted to cost per ton of CO reductions assuming suitable values of CO emissions per VMT and are reported as if the costs were allocated to CO reductions. Estimated energy savings are also reported separately.

An average CO emisson value of 41 gms (41×10^{-6} tons) per mile was assumed for 75° temperature areas and a value of 51 gms (51×10^{-6} tons) per mile was assumed for 20° temperature areas. These values are based on the Tables F-1 and F-3 of EPA document "Mobile Source Emission Factors." The average value was calculated using the values for the years 1982, 1984 and 1987.

Cost and Effectiveness of Local TCM Programs

The costs of local control programs are available in literature and are generally expressed in $ per Vehicle Hour of Travel (VHT). It was assumed that 1 VHT is equivalent to 25 VMT so that costs could be expressed in $ per VMT. The following four strategies were selected for estimating average costs of local TCM programs. These are the strategies for which general data were readily available.

	Assumed Cost/VMT $	Estimated Cost/Ton 20° temp $	Estimated Cost/Ton 75° temp $	Average of 20° & 75° values $	Assumed Effectiveness in CO Reduction
a. Signal Timing optimization	.001	19.60	24.40	22	2%
b. Computerized Control of streets flow	0.01	196	244	220	0.5%
c. Freeway surveillance and control	0.04	784	976	880	0.3%
d. Truck restrictions on certain streets	0.02	396	488	440	0.2%
				Total	3%

Costs and Effectiveness of Areawide TCM Programs

Four strategies have been selected for the purposes of estimating average costs of areawide TCM programs. These are the strategies for which general data were readily available.

Strategy	Assumed Cost/VMT $	Estimated Cost/Ton 20° temp $	Estimated Cost/Ton 75° temp $	Average of 20° & 75° valued $	Assumed Effectiveness in CO Reduction
a. Ridesharing	0.02	390	480	435	.8%
b. Transit improvement with express bus service	0.43	8,430	10,500	9,465	0.5%
c. Local bus service improvement	0.40	7,840	9,750	8,795	0.5%
d. Work rescheduling	0.01	195	240	218	0.2%
				Total	2%

Approach Used in the Computer Program to Calculate TCM Costs

Based on the study of the cost effectiveness of various strategies and keeping in mind that various areas may need various strategies, it was assumed that typically:

1. Up to 3% reduction in CO emissions can be accomplished at an average cost of $170/ton of CO reduction. This is the weighted average cost (rounded-up value) of the local TCM programs, i.e.,

$$170 \simeq [(22 \times .02) + (220 \times .005) + 880 \times .003) + (440 \times .002)]/.03$$

2. Another 1% reduction can be accomplished at a average cost of $400/ton. This is a rounded-up value of the weighted average cost of ridesharing and work rescheduling programs, i.e.,

$$400 \simeq [(435 \times .008) + (218 \times .002)]/.01$$

3. A further 1% reduction results if public transit improvments are implemented and the average cost per ton is $9200/ton. This is the rounded-up value of express bus and local bus improvement programs, i.e.,

$$9200 \simeq [(9465 \times .005) + (8795 \times .005)]/.01$$

Potential Fuel Economy Due to TCM

The amount of gasoline saved per ton of CO reduction due to TCM strategies has been estimated assuming an average value of 46* gms (46×10^{-6} tons) CO emissions per mile and a gasoline consumption of 1 gallon per 20 miles.

Thus, gasoline saved per ton of CO reduction due to TCM

$$= \frac{10^6}{46 \times 20} \simeq 1088 \text{ gallons/ton of CO reduction}$$

Above are the initial values selected. However, these have been treated as parameters in the program so that, if necessary, improved values can easily be used.

---

*$46 = \frac{51 + 41}{2}$; 51 gms/mile for 20° temperature and 41 gms/mile for 75° temperature used in earlier calculations.